



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,993	05/11/2006	Eugene Sherry	5000-061503	5104
28289	7590	08/22/2008	EXAMINER	
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			JOHNSON, AMY COHEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2841	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/578,993	SHERRY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Amy Cohen Johnson	2841

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 16-22 and 25-30.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

/G. Bradley Bennett/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2841

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment does not appear to place the application in better for appeal since the proposed change to claim 25 creates a lack of antecedent basis problem for claims 26 and 27 regarding the term "said acetabular cup" in those claims. Further, the proposed change does not overcome the objection to claims 25-27 since it does not further limit the structure of the apparatus claim. Wherein further limiting the preamble does not further limit the structure of the body of claim 16.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 16-22, 25-28 over Fishbane in view of Shue et al are directed to the intended use of the device being "for mounting of said gauge to a prosthetic component and a predefined site of a patient to allow correlation between the predefined site of said patient and positioning of said prosthetic component". In response to applicant's argument that Fishbane does not disclose a connector disposed on a body for mounting of a gauge to a prosthetic component, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case, the device of Fishbane is considered to be capable of performing the function of mounting to a prosthetic component. Further, there is no structure claimed regarding the connection to the prosthetic component or predefined site on a patient that would distinguish the claim language over the structure of Fishbane. Fishbane is used as a gauge in a surgical procedure, wherein the surgical procedure is a hip replacement (Fishbane, Col 1, lines 19-34), therefore, Fishbane is considered to be capable of performing the intended use.

Applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 29 and 30 over Paul in view of Arthur are directed to the intended use of the device being "for connection of said gauge to a prosthetic component of a predefined site of a patient". In response to applicant's argument that the connector of Paul, the adhesive, does not connect to a prosthetic component, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case, the adhesive of Paul is considered to be capable of performing the function of connecting to a prosthetic component since adhesive will adhere to a prosthetic component. Further, there is no structure claimed regarding the connection to the prosthetic component or predefined site on a patient that would distinguish the claim language over the structure of Paul.